

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FIVE

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE
OF CALIFORNIA,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

DANIEL SEGOVIA,

Defendant and Appellant.

B303528

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. VA042532)

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Patrick T. Meyers, Judge. Affirmed.

Stephen Borgo for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance by Plaintiff and Respondent.

Defendant Daniel Segovia appeals a downward modification of his sentence. Defendant was initially sentenced to prison for carjacking (Pen. Code, § 215), with a full-term consecutive sentence of four years for assault with a deadly weapon (Pen. Code, § 245, subd. (a)(1)), consisting of the two-year low term, doubled for a prior strike (Pen. Code, § 1170.12).

After 20 years passed, the trial court modified defendant's sentence so that the consecutive term for assault with a deadly weapon was only two years, consisting of one-third the middle term of three years, doubled for the prior strike.

On May 19, 2020, defendant's appointed counsel filed a brief pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*). The brief included a declaration that counsel had written to defendant, explaining the brief he was filing, and informing defendant of his right to file a supplemental brief. This court sent defendant a letter advising him that a *Wende* brief had been filed and that he had 30 days to submit a brief or letter raising any issues he wished us to consider. Defendant did not file a supplemental brief.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that defendant's attorney has fully complied with his responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436.) Specifically, the subordinate consecutive term was required to consist of only one-third the middle term, doubled for the strike. (Pen. Code, § 1170.1, subd. (a).)

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

RUBIN, P. J.

WE CONCUR:

MOOR, J.

KIM, J.